

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION

TIAWAN BRITTON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	FILE No. _____
CONTOUR 5151 ONH LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, TIAWAN BRITTON, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendant CONTOUR 5151 ONH LLC pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

2. Venue is proper in the federal District Court for the Northern District

of Georgia, Atlanta Division.

### **PARTIES**

3. Plaintiff TIAWAN BRITTON (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Atlanta, Georgia (Fulton County).

4. Plaintiff suffers from Spinal Muscular Atrophy (“SMA”) and is disabled as defined by the ADA.

5. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and pinching.

6. Plaintiff cannot walk and uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

7. Defendant CONTOUR 5151 ONH LLC (hereinafter “Defendant”) is a Delaware limited liability company that transacts business in the state of Georgia and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: CT Corporation System, 289 S. Culver Street, Lawrenceville, Georgia 30046.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. On multiple occasions, including, but not limited to, March 28, 2019

and March 22, 2021, Plaintiff was a customer at “Manding Cafe,” a business located at 5145 Old National Highway, College Park, Georgia 30349.

10. Defendant is the owner (or co-owner) of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action. (The contiguous structures and improvements situated upon said real property shall be referenced herein as the “Facility,” and said real property shall be referenced herein as the “Property”).

11. Plaintiff lives approximately ten (10) miles from the Facilities and Property.

12. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 2654 Godby Road, College Park, Georgia 30349 (of which 5145 Old National Highway is a part), Fulton County Property Appraiser’s Parcel ID Number 13 006800010720, and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

13. Plaintiff has visited the Facility and Property at least twice before and intends on revisiting the Facility and Property once the Facility and Property are

made accessible.

14. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Facility and Property to purchase goods and/or services.

15. Plaintiff travelled to the Facility and Property as a customer and as an advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to his access of the Facility and Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Facility and Property.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

16. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* (the “ADA”).

17. The ADA provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from its enactment to implement its requirements.

18. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 (if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

19. The Facility is a public accommodation and service establishment.

20. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

21. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991,

the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

22. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

23. Liability for violations under Title III or the ADA falls on “any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation.” 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

24. The Facility must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

25. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

26. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Facility and the Property in his capacity as a customer of the Facility and Property, and as an advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Facility and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges,

advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

27. Plaintiff intends to visit the Facility and Property again in the future as a customer and as an advocate for the disabled in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Facility and Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Facility and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

28. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Facility and Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

29. Defendant will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Facility and Property, including those specifically

set forth herein, and make the Facility and Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

30. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Facility and Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Facility and Property include, but are not limited to:

- a. Accessible parking spaces are not properly located and/or distributed on the Property, in violation of section 208.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- b. One or more accessible parking spaces on the Property are not located on the shortest accessible route from the accessible parking space(s) to the accessible entrances of the Facility, in violation of section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- c. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5155 of the Facility are missing proper identification signage, in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- d. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most

proximate to Unit 5155 of the Facility each have a slope in excess of 1:48 (one to forty-eight), in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, and is not level.

- e. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5155 of the Facility are each not adequately marked, in violation of section 502.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- f. The access aisle adjacent to the 2 (two) accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5155 of the Facility is not level due to the presence of a ramp within the boundaries of said access aisle, in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This ramp also protrudes into the boundaries of the adjacent accessible parking spaces, in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- g. The 2 (two) accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5137 of the Facility are missing proper identification signage, in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- h. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most



proximate to Unit 5137 of the Facility each have a slope in excess of 1:48 (one to forty-eight), in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, and is not level.

- i. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5137 of the Facility are each not adequately marked, in violation of section 502.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- j. The access aisle adjacent to the two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5137 of the Facility is not level due to the presence of a ramp within the boundaries of said access aisle, in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- k. One of the two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 5137 of the Facility has an improperly installed parking stop within its boundaries, resulting in excessive vertical rises in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, and further, reducing its dimensions, in violation of sections 502.1 and 502.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.

- l. The accessible ramp on the Property most proximate to Unit 2676 of the Facility has a slope exceeding 1:12 (one to twelve), in violation of section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- m. The two accessible parking spaces on the Property most proximate to Unit 2680 of the Facility are missing proper identification signage, in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- n. The accessible parking space on the Property most proximate to Unit 2686 does not have an access aisle adjacent to it, in violation of section 502.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- o. The accessible ramp on the Property most proximate to Unit 2686 of the Facility has a slope exceeding 1:12 (one to twelve), in violation of section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- p. There is an excessive vertical rise at the base of the above-described accessible ramp on the Property most proximate to Unit 2686 of the Facility, in violation of section 405.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.

31. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the

Facility and Property.

32. Plaintiff requires an inspection of Facility and Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Facility and Property in violation of the ADA.

33. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

34. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Facility and Property into compliance with the ADA.

35. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Facility and Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

36. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Facility and Property is readily achievable because Defendant has the financial resources to make the necessary modifications.

37. Upon information and good faith belief, the Facility and Property have been altered since 2010.

38. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

39. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property, including those alleged herein.

40. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

41. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant.

42. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

43. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant to modify the Facility and Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendant in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant from

continuing its discriminatory practices;

- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Facility and Property to make them readily accessible to, and useable by, individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff's counsel reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: June 11, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Craig J. Ehrlich

Craig J. Ehrlich

Georgia Bar No. 242240

The Law Office of Craig J. Ehrlich, LLC

1123 Zonolite Road, N.E., Suite 7-B

Atlanta, Georgia 30306

Tel: (800) 238-3857

Fax: (855) 415-2480

craig@ehrllichlawoffice.com

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 5.1**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document has been prepared in accordance with the font type and margin requirements of Local Rule

5.1 of the Northern District of Georgia, using a font type of Times New Roman and a point size of 14.

/s/Craig J. Ehrlich  
Craig J. Ehrlich